United Nations S/PV.3551

Security Council

Fiftieth Year

Provisional

3551st Meeting

Wednesday, 5 July 1995, 4 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Martínez Blanco	(Honduras)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Sersale di Cerisano
	Botswana	Mr. Motswagae
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Czech Republic	Mr. Rovensky
	France	Mr. Merimée
	Germany	Mr. Henze
	Indonesia	Mr. Wibisono
	Italy	Mr. Ferrarin
	Nigeria	Mr. Ayewah
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Sidorov
	Rwanda	Mr. Ubalijoro
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay
	United States of America	Mrs. Albright

Agenda

The situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Letter dated 25 June 1995 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1995/510)

95-85591 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of July, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute on behalf of the Council to His Excellency Mr. Detlev Graf Zu Rantzau, Permanent Representative of Germany to the United Nations, for his service as President of the Security Council for the month of June 1995. I am sure that I speak for all members of the Security Council in expressing deep appreciation to Ambassador Graf Zu Rantzau for the great diplomatic skill and unfailing courtesy with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Letter dated 25 June 1995 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1995/510)

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Nobilo (Croatia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I have also received a request dated 5 July 1995 from Ambassador Dragomir Djokic to address the Council. With the consent of the Council, I propose to invite him to address the Council in the course of the discussion of the item before it.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the letter dated 25 June 1995 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the report by the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, concerning the operations of the International Conference's Mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (S/1995/510).

Members of the Council also have before them document S/1995/537, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the Czech Republic, France, Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Members of the Council have also received photocopies of a letter dated 5 July 1995 from the Chargé d'affaires *ad interim* of the Permanent Mission of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations and the Permanent Representative of Croatia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, which will be issued as document S/1995/538.

The first speaker on my list is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, His Excellency Mr. Muhamed Sacirbey, whom I welcome and whom I invite to make his statement.

Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina): It is with pleasure and confidence that we see you, Sir, taking over the job of President of the Security Council. At the same time, let me not forget the contributions of your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Germany, especially in the very able manner in which he handled the responsibilities of the presidency of the Council during the month of June.

Before I continue with my presentation, I should like to alert the Council to the following information, which has just come to our attention. A few hours ago, one jet of the Serbian forces besieging the Bihac area engaged in an air-to-ground assault upon the Bihac "safe area". We note this one incident among several that have occurred over the past few days, for it seems to represent a growing tendency to test the Security Council's will to see the "no-fly zone" over the Republic of Bosnia and

Herzegovina implemented and, to our dismay, has in fact failed to elicit an adequate response.

We particularly note the plight of the civilian population of the Bihac region because, over the past several days, several unfortunate civilians have lost their lives as a consequence of malnutrition and a lack of essentials. This includes a three-year old boy who, at the time of his death, weighed no more than 15 pounds.

In view of the current, as well as the potential additional rewards offered to it, we should expect the Belgrade regime to enter into mutual recognition with its neighbours, to shut off support and supplies for the Karadzic Serbs and thereby to promote the peace process. Unfortunately, exactly the opposite seems to be occurring. Instead, the Belgrade regime is rounding up draft-age men and sending them back to serve in the so-called Krajina and Bosnian Serb armies. Belgrade continues to pay the salaries of the troops, and especially the officers, of the so-called Krajina and Bosnian Serb armies. Belgrade continues to provide further strategic support — including weapons, fuel and coordination — for the so-called Krajina and Bosnian Serb armies. As an example, the United States F-16 and its American pilot, Scott O'Grady, may have been shot down by anti-aircraft systems of the so-called Bosnian Serb army, but this anti-aircraft system was controlled by an air-defence system linked directly through Belgrade. And the list of inconsistencies is continually growing.

So, one might ask why the Security Council should continue to support for an additional 75 days the process of sanctions relief for what appears to be a double game on the part of the Belgrade regime and in particular the porous border-sealing with respect to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Maybe the most honest answer is that this is the least worst of a set of bad options available in support of a negotiated settlement.

No matter how accurate this answer is now, it cannot be the basis ultimately for a successful political process to find peace. Belgrade cannot be allowed effectively to dictate the peace process because no attractive alternatives are perceived. Otherwise, this entire current approach is not only likely to fail, but could in fact become counter-productive.

If Belgrade wishes to secure further sanctions relief or even to maintain the current easing of sanctions, it must be made to understand that the border closure must be real, that the recognition of its neighbours — including the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Croatia — must be unambiguous, and that its support for the peace process must be sincere and not just a tactical step.

The fence-sitting attitude of some in trying to secure Belgrade's cooperation has not only served to encourage Mr. Milosevic and his cohorts to be even more obstinate and ambiguous, but has in fact encouraged Mr. Milosevic and others to try to dictate the terms of peace. In particular, Mr. Milosevic believes now that he can define the international legal nature of the Bosnia and Herzegovina that he is to recognize and in such a fashion make his recognition not only ambiguous but in fact counter-productive. Mr. Milosevic is positioning himself to recognize a Bosnia and Herzegovina devoid of sovereignty and only contained in temporary international borders that would be subject to change at will by Belgrade. Effectively, his strategy is to declare a recognition that promotes the advancement of an ethnically pure Greater Serbia, rather than one that confirms the most basic elements of sovereignty and territorial integrity.

In the meantime, let us take inventory of what the Security Council's actions in easing sanctions with respect to Serbia have achieved so far. Terrorist actions and the strangulation of the people of Sarajevo and other Bosnian towns and cities continue. More than ever before, the Belgrade regime and the Bosnian Serbs have been obstinate with respect to peace movements. The targeting of United Nations officials, troops and other workers has increased. Finally and most recently, while the basketball team of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia enjoyed the opportunity to participate in the recent European championship, it ended its participation by signalling to the crowd the sign of the Chetnik Serbs — those that in fact conduct aggression and "ethnic cleansing" against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This same basketball team has also promised to give some of its medals to the leadership of the so-called Krajina and the so-called Karadzic Serbs.

Obviously, when taking inventory of the consequences, the result is less than clear. But let us be clear on this point: we do not ask for anything more than the legal recognition by the Belgrade regime of our sovereignty and territorial integrity and what the United Nations has already recognized in the context of our membership in this Organization.

On the other hand, we will not accept anything less and others cannot degrade our legal status by self-serving

and dangerous definitions of our sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Belgrade regime can choose to recognize the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally-recognized borders without condition, or it can choose to do nothing. Similarly, if it is sincere in supporting the peace process in the region, then the border sealing must also be sincere. We can all benefit from this sincerity. But Belgrade will in fact reap the greatest rewards. On the other hand, if Belgrade is not sincere, we will all lose, but Belgrade will in fact lose the most.

For this reason, we emphasize that the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina must and will wait for a sincere partner in Belgrade in the process of mutual recognition and peace.

Consequently, we believe the Security Council must, and should, also wait for a sincere Belgrade.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Croatia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Nobilo (Croatia): At the outset, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July and to assure you of my delegation's full support and cooperation on the many important issues involving our region and other matters now before the Security Council.

Allow me also to express my delegation's sincere congratulations to the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany for the exemplary way in which they led the work of the Council last month.

I should like first of all to reiterate the words of my Foreign Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who joins us today, as expressed in their letter to you this morning, that the peace process in the region has become deadlocked by, first, the refusal of the Serbs in Pale to accept the Contact Group plan for Bosnia and Herzegovina; secondly, the refusal of the Serbs in Knin to accept the mandate of the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia (UNCRO) and, thirdly, the intensified interference by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in the affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia.

It is the strong position of our two Governments that the only way out of this impasse is for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to recognize not only the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also the Republic of Croatia, and for the international community to establish the Security Council-mandated effective border closure of the relevant borders of Serbia and Montenegro with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, and the relevant borders between Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia. The present situation in the region does not bode well for the peace process in general, for the continued presence of the United Nations peace-keepers in the region, and for the necessary end to renewed hostilities in some parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The peace process has also been derailed by the unfortunate devaluation of the Security Council mandate for the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) border mission on the Serbia and Montenegro/Bosnia and Herzegovina border. The ICFY has clearly reinterpreted its mandate to mean partial closing of the border, and not effective closing, as was originally envisaged by the Security Council. The ICFY report concerning 688 incidents of border crossings by military personnel for the period, which do not indicate whether these involve one soldier per incident or an entire bus-load, best illustrates the depreciation of the mission's mandate and effectiveness.

My Government has given ample evidence that the relevant border is not effectively closed. My Foreign Minister wrote to the Security Council on 28 June, giving concrete and detailed evidence on how and where the border had been violated. The Minister's letter was followed by numerous independent reports, even including reports from the independent media from Serbia and Montenegro, effectively confirming the evidence presented by my Government.

The Croatian Government therefore considers the present ICFY border mission report and certification erroneous and factually wrong, and therefore null and void. We call on the Security Council thoroughly to review the work of the ICFY mission and to clarify whether its mandate means partial or effective closure of the border. If the Security Council decides that its mandate is indeed for a partial closure of the border, my Government will have to re-evaluate its position in the

peace process and its position on the likelihood of the successful implementation of the UNCRO mandate that also calls for border control — in this case, between Croatia and Serbia, and the relevant borders between Croatia and Bosnia.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of Croatia for the kind words he addressed to me.

In accordance with the decision taken earlier in the meeting, I now invite Ambassador Dragomir Djokic to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Djokic: Let me begin by expressing regret that previous speakers have once again used a meeting of the Security Council to advance untrue and malicious allegations against my country, which we categorically reject.

The situation in the former Yugoslavia is far too serious for the Council to be manipulated in order to satisfy the domestic and political propaganda needs of certain countries. The delegations that have again chosen to voice such allegations have thus shown that they are not striving for the attainment of a just and lasting peaceful solution.

Two hundred and seventy-five days have passed since the Security Council first decided to suspend a very limited and virtually symbolic number of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In these nine months the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia have regularly submitted reports to the Council in which they stated that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was fully living up to its commitment to close its border with the Bosnian Serbs and that its decision to break off political and economic links with the Bosnian Serb leadership was being continually respected.

This was, of course, a unilateral decision by my Government, which was adopted with the aim of influencing the Bosnian Serb leadership to accept the Contact Group peace plan as a starting point for further negotiations in the search for a political solution to the Bosnian crisis.

Despite the evident constructive and peace-oriented policy of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia — which has been increasingly acknowledged and appreciated — and the fact that it has fulfilled absolutely all the conditions set forth by the resolutions by which the sanctions were introduced, the Security Council has not been able to muster the political will to lift the sanctions unconditionally and, in so doing, to achieve a significant breakthrough in the status quo and a substantial step towards peace.

Instead, the Council is continuing to pursue a stubborn and myopic policy by collectively punishing the peoples of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and causing enormous damage to overall economic and social development in Yugoslavia, as well as in neighbouring countries. The policy of sanctions is having a very serious detrimental and destabilizing effect on the whole of south-east Europe. Traditional trading patterns have been severed, regular transit routes disrupted and the inclusion of this region within European integration processes postponed.

Even the very limited suspension of sanctions has been fraught with many problems, due primarily to the unwillingness of some States to implement relevant resolutions of the Security Council. For instance, it is still impossible to buy or reserve an aeroplane ticket from the territory of the United States to Belgrade. Because of the short time-frame of the sanctions relief, it has also been very difficult for Yugoslav sportsmen and teams to take part in many international competitions which are scheduled for periods longer than 75 days. Cultural cooperation has also been hampered for the same reasons.

As a policy instrument, the sanctions have been an outright failure. They have not stopped the bloodshed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, nor it can be hoped that they will ever do so. They have served only to conceal, like a fig leaf, the failure of the policies of the international community in its attempt to resolve the crisis in the former Yugoslavia.

Historically, sanctions have proved to be a blunt and ineffective instrument. They cause tremendous humanitarian suffering among the civilian population, where children, the weak and the elderly are as a rule the hardest hit, and they very seldom fundamentally influence the policy of target countries. On the contrary: they tend to stiffen resolve and promote a general feeling of conspiracy among the people against which they are implemented.

What is taking place in Bosnia is a civil war based on century-old animosities. The Federal Republic of

Yugoslavia, as has been repeatedly stated in the reports of the Secretary-General, is not a party to this war and is, on the contrary, investing great efforts to facilitate a negotiated settlement. Recently, for example, the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia helped in resolving the hostage crisis. Criticism has now arisen that since the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia managed to broker the release of the hostages, it is evident that its influence over the Bosnian Serbs is still overwhelming. On the other hand, had the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia not acted in such a way and if the hostages were still being held, it would have been condemned for not having done enough to ensure their release. Whatever the outcome, it seems that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia does not get the benefit of the doubt or the credit that it is due.

Reports of alleged cooperation of the Yugoslav army with the Bosnian Serbs are absolutely not true and are regularly portrayed as false by the reports of the Co-Chairmen. It is indeed indicative that no Government has submitted official information on such violations to the Co-Chairmen, yet these concerns are raised within the Security Council. We can only interpret such blatant fabrications as a form of extracting even more concessions from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and particularly its early recognition of Bosnia and Herzegovina. On the other hand, the Security Council turns a blind eye to the flagrant breaches of the arms embargo by the Bosnian Muslim and Croatian Governments, as well as to the presence of the regular army of Croatia in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is prepared to recognize the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina once the political problems affecting its nations are on the way to being resolved. Also, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia insists that the sanctions first be lifted before any recognition moves are made.

The perpetuation of the sanctions, and the setting of more unjustified conditions for their lifting, is absolutely absurd. There were never any justified reasons for introducing the sanctions in the first place. Their maintenance is all the more untenable now, when the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is investing major efforts to contribute to the search for a just and peaceful settlement of the crisis. Those who continue to insist that they remain in place obviously have other goals in mind and are not motivated by a sincere wish to find a political solution to the crisis.

Only negotiations, and not the use of force, the lifting of the arms embargo or the deployment of new troops, can be conducive to such an outcome.

If the Security Council wishes truly to open the road towards peace in the former Yugoslavia, it must have the courage to make a resolute move and lift the sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia altogether. That would undermine the position of extremists in all camps who see the sanctions as a pretext for pursuing the war option. The view that by lifting the sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia the international community would lose its leverage and influence on the policies of Belgrade is absolutely false. The sanctions only foster resistance and set limits within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on greater cooperation with the international community. If they were lifted, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia would become a full and equal partner in the peace process and could even more effectively contribute to the attainment of a just and lasting settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We would like to believe that the Security Council will soon summon the strength — and the wisdom, in particular — to take this step.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Sidorov (Russian Federation) *(interpretation from Russian)*: First of all, allow me to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of this post of great responsibility and to assure you of the Russian delegation's readiness to cooperate fully with you. I should also like to request the German delegation to convey our gratitude to Ambassador Graf zu Rantzau for his skilful leadership of the work of the Security Council during the month of June.

Russia will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution on extending the partial suspension of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia because it believes that the draft resolution's contents can hardly be considered an appropriate way of encouraging a

constructive policy on the part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the matter of a peaceful settlement.

Suffice it to recall the past history of this question. In August 1994, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia decided voluntarily — I repeat, voluntarily — to close its border with Bosnia and Herzegovina to all goods except humanitarian supplies and requested the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia to deploy on the border an international Mission to assist in the implementation of this decision. In response to this courageous and difficult step, the Security Council adopted resolution 943 (1994) which, as an act of political encouragement to Belgrade, provided for the lifting of certain measures of — let us be frank — symbolic rather than real economic significance.

The time that has elapsed since the adoption of that resolution has fully and totally confirmed that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is playing a positive role in connection with the situation in the former Yugoslavia. This, incidentally, was recently demonstrated in the dramatic situation involving the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) hostages.

As is clear from the most recent report of the Co-Chairmen of the ICFY (S/1995/510), the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is continuing to meet its commitment to close the border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The cooperation of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia continues to be good, and the problems that arise are being resolved effectively.

Under these circumstances, in our view, the constructive policy of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia merits appropriate encouragement in the form of a further easing of the burden of sanctions. The Security Council should have at the very least made the partial suspension of sanctions indefinite in extent, as was proposed by the Russian Federation.

Unfortunately, this proposal, once again, was not adopted. As was the case in resolution 988 (1995), the draft resolution is extending the suspension of the sanctions for a reduced period of only 75 days. This is all the more incomprehensible since the draft provides for the immediate imposition of sanctions if Belgrade violates its commitments.

We cannot agree with the continually repeated tactic of arbitrarily tacking on far-fetched and irrelevant elements to the decision on the question of suspending sanctions. Thus, a new preambular paragraph has appeared that speaks to the importance of the cessation of military assistance to the Bosnian Serbs. In addition to the fact that this provision goes beyond the bounds of resolution 713 (1991), which establishes a general and complete embargo on all deliveries of weapons and military equipment to the region of the former Yugoslavia, it is also particularly untenable with respect to assertions concerning financing and coordination of air defence, and is in no way confirmed by ICFY reports. Most important, this provision is directed at one of the parties to the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while the responsibility for the recent drastic deterioration of the situation there is borne not only and not so much by the Bosnian Serbs. As a matter of principle, if this ban is to be extended to all forms of military assistance, then it should apply to all parties to the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. A unilateral application of such an approach will inevitably be interpreted by the parties as the manifestation of a double standard, with all of the ensuing negative consequences.

We cannot agree either with the inclusion in the operative part of the draft of paragraph 3, with its call for mutual recognition between the States on the territory of the former Yugoslavia, with as a first step recognition between the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). This provision clearly does not fit within the context of a generally technical and limited extension of the suspension of a minimal set of sanctions for a short period of time, and it is still not clear as to how it might affect the diplomatic contacts being undertaken at the present time.

Our delegation cannot fail to express its regret regarding the fact that during work on the draft, its co-sponsors were not able adequately to take into account the views of a number of delegations, including that of the Russian Federation. This represents a departure from the recent and positive trend in the Security Council to reach consensus decisions which reflect the positions of all its members and thus acquire greater authority and effectiveness.

Under these circumstances, Russia cannot support such a draft resolution, although it fully backs not only an easing but also a lifting of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. We hope that the next time this question is considered, the Security Council will be able to take a decision that will truly and fully

promote the interests of achieving a comprehensive political settlement.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of the Russian Federation for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Henze (Germany): First of all, I want to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. My delegation is fully confident that your wise counsel and long political experience will guide us through the work of the Security Council during the month of July, and I wish to assure you of our cooperation. I should like also to thank the preceding speakers for their words of appreciation for the work of Ambassador Graf Rantzau as President of the Council during the month of June. We will not fail to transmit them to him.

The draft resolution that we will adopt today is a follow-up to Security Council resolutions 943 (1994), 970 (1995) and, lastly, 988 (1995) of 21 April 1995. These resolutions have suspended certain sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) at more or less regular intervals. Therefore, some may believe that the draft resolution before the Council today is a matter of routine.

For obvious reasons, it is not. We all continue to be well aware of the painful events that led to the imposition of sanctions on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1992. We are also well aware of the continued human suffering in Bosnia, in particular in Sarajevo and Bihac and in the eastern enclaves, on which we have just received additional information. It is against this background that the Council will be taking its decision.

The issue we are discussing today continues to be a crucial element in the ongoing international efforts to de-escalate the crisis in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as in the other States in the former Yugoslavia. We believe that without an effective border closure by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, there will be no de-escalation in Bosnia.

Keeping these facts in mind, we have analysed carefully the situation on the ground and the draft resolution before the Council. According to the report of the Secretary-General before us, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia continues to maintain the border closure between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina now under the control of Bosnian Serb forces. The report of the Secretary-General also states that the cooperation of the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) with Yugoslav authorities continues to be good. We pay tribute to the dedicated efforts of the members of the ICFY Mission.

However, having studied the report carefully, we could not ignore the clear indications of serious shortcomings in the border closure. In particular, the report refers to 688 incidents of border crossings by military personnel. It is disturbing that we do not know how many persons were involved in these incidents, where they went, and how they were armed and equipped.

Even more serious are recently incoming reports on the increasing number of draft-age young men forcibly transferred by Federal Republic of Yugoslavia authorities into the Serb-held territories of the Republic of Croatia and into the territories under the control of the Bosnian Serbs.

My delegation therefore finds it appropriate and fully justified that the draft resolution before us should send a clear signal to the authorities in Belgrade not to engage in military assistance. There must be no transport of military personnel across the border, no support with military equipment, no financial assistance, no coordination of air defences. To do otherwise would not only jeopardize the international peace effort, but would also undermine the credibility of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia authorities in the ongoing negotiations.

A key to the future stability of the region and to a peaceful settlement of the continuing crisis remains the mutual recognition of all States of the former Yugoslavia. The international community and the Security Council should, accordingly, be ready to consider further substantial sanctions-relief measures if and when the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has agreed to and implemented the necessary steps for the mutual recognition of the States of the former Yugoslavia within their internationally recognized borders and has agreed to and implemented the strengthening of the border closure régime and its international monitoring. This is the clear and positive message that the Security Council wants to send to the leadership and to the people of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Like ordinary Bosnian citizens in Sarajevo or ordinary Croat citizens in Zagreb, the overwhelming

majority of the people in Belgrade and in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) are yearning for an end to war and conflict. Germany is very much looking forward to a time when a responsible policy striving in words and deeds for peace in the Balkans is pursued and implemented by the Belgrade authorities. We look forward to a time when the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) can again find a respected place in the international community. Germany would be the first to welcome and support such a development.

It is in this spirit that the German delegation will vote for the draft resolution before us.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of Germany for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia): As this is the first time my delegation has had the opportunity to speak this month, I should like to extend to you, Sir, my delegation's sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July and to assure you of our continuing support.

I should also like to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Detlev Graf Zu Rantzau of Germany, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the work of the Council last month, and to wish him all the best for the future.

The Indonesian delegation would further like to express its appreciation to the joint sponsors of the draft resolution that is before us today, which provides for the extension, for a period of 75 days, of the partial easing of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), as originally adopted under Security Council resolutions 943 (1994), 970 (1995) and 988 (1995). My delegation would also like to thank the Secretary-General and the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) for the invaluable periodic reports detailing the closure of the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We note that the reports issued since the adoption of Security Council resolution 988 (1995) contain the assessment by the Mission Coordinator that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has continued to meet its commitment to close its border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We further note that the period was relatively free of controversy about alleged air violations of the border. The latest report by the ICFY Co-Chairmen indicates that no unexplained radar contacts have been reported by the airfield monitors of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR). The Indonesian delegation is encouraged by the recent substantial increases in confiscations in most categories of goods along the border, which is indicative of the Mission's increased effectiveness. Above all, the Indonesian delegation is heartened by the improved financial situation facing the Mission, which has enabled the Co-Chairmen to authorize an increase in Mission personnel to 200. It is indeed our hope that henceforth the Mission will be provided with means commensurate with its important responsibilities.

Yet my delegation cannot fail to note the continuing shortcomings in the border closure. The substantial increases in confiscations, to which I alluded earlier, may also be indicative of an increasing trend in the illegal transport of materials. We are concerned that interceptions of smuggling attempts, confiscations, fines and penalties are perhaps increasingly becoming acceptable "costs" as far as the smugglers are concerned. The Indonesian delegation would like to reaffirm the importance of efforts by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to enhance even further the effectiveness of the border closure.

Other concerns of our delegation are the well-documented repeated incidents involving threats to Mission personnel and attempts at border violations, both of which we believe require urgent attention. Threats to Mission personnel aimed at hindering their freedom of movement cannot be tolerated. We also believe that the violations of the border closure detailed in Section VII of the latest report by the ICFY Co-Chairmen should not be dismissed too readily. The Indonesian delegation is particularly concerned to learn that uniformed personnel continue to cross the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina — a clear violation of the border closure. We should like to see this issue addressed as a matter of priority, since complacency regarding such incidents can only lead to an increase in their frequency.

On balance, my delegation does not currently see the need for any major revision in the existing arrangements relating to the partial easing of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Therefore, we welcome the draft resolution, since it basically

reaffirms the elements contained in resolution 988 (1995). We would like to underline three elements contained in the draft resolution which we believe to be of particular importance to its success.

First — and this is a matter that we have addressed previously — our delegation has found the reports of border crossings of uniformed personnel to be unsettling. We would therefore like to underline the draft resolution's emphasis on there being no provision of military assistance of any kind to the Bosnian Serb forces in terms of finance, equipment, coordination of air defences or recruitment of troops. Secondly, my delegation would like to echo the necessity of the appropriate resources being made available to the Mission so that it is able to carry out its tasks effectively. Thirdly, the Indonesian delegation underscores the call for early mutual recognition between the States of the former Yugoslavia of their internationally recognized borders. Such an action would constitute an important step towards furthering an atmosphere of trust and cooperation. By taking this most basic step, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia would send a clear and unequivocal message of its peaceful intent to the international community.

Clearly, the long-recognized shortcomings of the border closure have not been completely overcome in the past 75 days. Moreover, during those 75 days we have witnessed ever-increasing acts of defiance by the Bosnian Serb party, as reflected in the seizure of UNPROFOR personnel as hostages and the shelling of Bosnian cities and towns. In the face of such defiance, the mission must continue vigorously to enforce the border closures in an effort to persuade the Bosnian Serbs to end their intransigence. The Bosnian Serb party should have no doubt that the international community expects it to end its aggression and accept the Contact Group peace plan.

In view of these considerations, my delegation will support the adoption of the draft resolution.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of Indonesia for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Al-Khussaiby (Oman): On behalf of my delegation, allow me to convey to you, Sir, and to your friendly country, Honduras, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. I should also like to reassure you of my delegation's full support and cooperation in trying to facilitate your work in a manner that will further the noble causes for which this Organization was established.

At the same time, allow me to take this opportunity to extend our gratitude to the former Ambassador of Germany and to the members of his delegation for the skilful manner in which they steered the work of the Security Council during his presidency last month.

Nearly a year ago, the Security Council adopted resolution 943 (1994) regarding sanctions relief for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). Oman, which was among those that supported those measures and voted in favour of the resolution, continues to support the further extension of sanctions relief. The main reason for our decision relates to the assurances and indications given to us and to the international community at large that such a suspension would contribute positively to isolating the Bosnian Serbs, who still reject the territorial peace plan of the Contact Group, and would help create a positive political environment among all States in the region based on respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, international borders and mutual recognition.

The relevant reports submitted to the Council note with satisfaction that cooperation between the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) and the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia continues to be good and satisfactory. On the other hand, we would reaffirm the importance of further efforts on the part of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to enhance the effectiveness of the closure of the international border between that country and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina with respect to all goods except foodstuffs, medical supplies and clothing for essential humanitarian needs.

We hope that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) will exert its pressure on the Bosnian Serb party in a manner that will convince them to accept the peace plan. We further believe that one way of doing this is through effective border closure to prevent any military shipment from reaching that party.

With regard to the question of mutual recognition, my delegation is of the view that such a step will enhance the confidence-building measures between the countries of the Balkans. We also renew our call on Belgrade to expedite its recognition of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, the Republic of Slovenia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as referred to in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution before us. We are of the view that this important step will strengthen the ongoing peace efforts

and contribute positively to the consideration of additional sanctions relief by the Security Council in the future.

In support of the efforts of the international community, particularly those of the Contact Group, towards reaching a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina — based, as a starting point, on the acceptance of the peace plan, which still awaits the acceptance of the Bosnian Serbs, and based on our conviction that such sanctions relief, whenever it is associated with some concrete steps and commitments on the part of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) will surely enhance the prospects for peace, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of Oman for his kind words addressed to me.

I shall now put draft resolution S/1995/537 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Botswana, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Nigeria, Oman, Rwanda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Russian Federation

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: The result of the voting is as follows: 14 votes in favour, none against and one abstention. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted as resolution 1003 (1995).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mrs. Albright (United States of America): Let me take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency and to tell you that we are very much looking forward to working with you during this very important month.

I also ask the German delegation to convey our best wishes to Ambassador Graf zu Rantzau for his fine work and to wish him good luck.

It is now 275 days — three-quarters of a year — since we extended limited sanctions relief to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) for its stated commitment to seal its border with Bosnia and to sever official contacts with Pale. In that time, the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia — whose continued dedication and effectiveness we salute — has reported some improvement in the effectiveness of the border closure and in cooperation by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia authorities. These reports, however, have also continued to point out a number of shortcomings in Belgrade's willingness fully to implement its decision to isolate the Bosnian Serbs. It is those shortcomings that made my Government unwilling to accept an extension of 100 days and to insist on 75 days.

It should be recalled that the goal of extending limited sanctions relief to Belgrade is to increase the pressure on the Pale Serbs to accept a settlement of their conflict with the Government of Bosnia based on the Contact Group plan. My Government continues to believe that an effectively enforced closure of the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the territory now controlled by the Bosnian Serbs would help achieve that goal.

But this Council will have to remain vigilant if the limited suspension of sanctions is to achieve its purpose and thereby remain justified. Therefore, my Government is disturbed by indications of increasing military cooperation between the Belgrade authorities and the Pale Serbs. Specifically, there are indications that the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia are rounding up draft-age Bosnian Serb males and returning them to Bosnia, providing financial assistance and equipment to the Bosnian Serb army, and cooperating with Bosnian Serb air defence systems.

If these reports about assistance to the Bosnian Serbs are accurate, they would violate Belgrade's commitment to isolate Pale. Taken together, they raise serious doubts which, if not adequately clarified by Belgrade, would seriously weaken the case for continuing the limited suspension of sanctions. In our view, such violations would undermine the Council's key objective of persuading the Pale Serbs that there is no reasonable alternative to a negotiated solution. They would also

weaken our joint efforts to limit and contain the conflict in advance of a negotiated solution.

I also want to add a note of growing concern over reports of increased military support by Belgrade for the Croatian Serbs.

Between now and 18 September my Government will continue to pay close attention to these and other issues related to Belgrade's commitment to implement the border closure. We hope that the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY), within its own resources and employing resources that might be made available, will do the same.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words she addressed to me.

Mr. Ferrarin (Italy): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. I am convinced that your diplomatic skills will ensure smooth and effective work during this month and I assure you of the full cooperation of my delegation.

I also wish to extend our deep appreciation to the President of the Security Council for the month of June, Ambassador Graf zu Rantzau, and to the German delegation, for the outstanding way in which he guided the work of the Council last month.

The resolution the Security Council has just adopted extends the suspension of certain sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in the areas of civil aviation and cultural and sport events, for another 75-day period.

Italy would have rather preferred a suspension of the sanctions for a 100-day period. We decided however, to join the majority within the Council and to vote in favour of the resolution, which is a logical consequence of the report by the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia of 23 June 1995, with particular reference to the measures taken by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to maintain the effective closure of the international border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We maintain that it is possible to further improve the effectiveness of the closure of the border. We therefore encourage the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to make every effort to this end and to continue the ongoing cooperation with the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia.

Italy is also well aware of the important role that Belgrade plays in the framework of the peace process. We encourage the Belgrade authorities to actively carry out this role, and to exercise every positive influence on the Bosnian Serb side in order that they accept the peace plan of the Contact Group as a starting point.

Finally, we expect that the Yugoslav Government will show the utmost goodwill in its efforts to ensure a positive outcome of the negotiations which Mr. Carl Bildt is currently conducting in Belgrade.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of Italy for the kind words he addressed to me.

Ms. Wilmshurst (United Kingdom): May I first extend to you the congratulations of my delegation, Sir, on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. We look forward to working with your delegation.

I should also like to express our appreciation for the way in which your predecessor, Ambassador Graf zu Rantzau, presided over the Council's work in the month of June.

Last August, the Belgrade authorities took two important steps towards encouraging the emergence of a peaceful settlement in Bosnia. The first was to support the Contact Group proposals as a starting point for negotiations between the parties. The Bosnian Serb leadership, however, have not yet taken this essential step. We urge them to do so and thus to open the way for their participation in negotiations.

The second important step taken by Belgrade last August was to close their international border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina with respect to all goods except foodstuffs, medical supplies and clothing for essential humanitarian needs. The Co-Chairmen of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) have reported that Belgrade continues to meet its commitment to close that border, and that cooperation between the ICFY Mission and Belgrade remains good. My Government endorses that assessment, and continues to have the fullest confidence in the work of the Co-

Chairmen and of the ICFY mission. The resolution which the Council has just adopted, of which my Government was a sponsor, allows for the limited renewal of the suspension of sanctions on Belgrade. We believe that this step is justified in response to the actions of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to date.

Closure of the border has already brought very real material pressure to bear on the Bosnian Serb leadership in terms of its economic, political and military impact, and it is important that this pressure be maintained. We therefore expect the authorities in Belgrade to make further efforts to enhance the effectiveness of that closure and, in particular, to ensure that there is no provision of military assistance for the Bosnian Serb forces. We also look to the Governments in the region to play their part in ensuring that Bosnian Serb isolation is intensified, by taking steps to prevent trade diversion to Pale, whether by land or sea. And we look to the international community to join us in providing support, in terms of finance, manpower and equipment, to the ICFY Mission. It is particularly important that Governments bring to the attention of the ICFY Mission any information concerning suspected border violations, so that the Mission can follow up as appropriate.

Belgrade's closure of their border with Bosnia was an important step, but nevertheless it was only a first step. The logic of Belgrade's decision to isolate the Bosnian Serb leadership until they embrace the Contact Group's proposals as a starting point should, we believe, lead them to a further, very significant, step — that is, the recognition of Bosnia. The Council has made clear on numerous occasions the importance it attaches to early mutual recognition between the States of the Former Yugoslavia within their internationally recognized borders. We hope that the Council will in the near future be in a position to consider additional sanctions relief in the context of the Belgrade authorities having decided to take that further step — mutual recognition between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. My Government strongly commends the efforts so far of the new European Union Co-Chairman of the ICFY, Mr. Carl Bildt, and of his United Nations counterpart, Mr. Thorvald Stoltenberg, to that end. Time is short: we urge Belgrade to take that further step without delay and to move towards mutual recognition.

Mr. Qin Huasun (China) *(interpretation from Chinese)*: Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the important post of President of the Security Council. I am convinced that, given your wisdom, experience and outstanding talent, you will guide the Council to complete its work this month in a satisfactory manner. I also wish to thank Ambassador Graf zu Rantzau, President of the Council last month, for his successful guidance of the Council's work.

We have all along stood for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia and opposed resorting to sanctions or mandatory actions in this connection, for facts have proved that sanctions or pressure will not help at all, but will instead further complicate and perpetuate problems.

We are of the view that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is an important factor for restoring peace and stability in the region of the former Yugoslavia. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has been cooperating with the international community, including on such questions as closing its border with Bosnia and Herzegovina. The international community should constantly encourage and support these efforts by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and translate such encouragement, first of all, into the gradual removal of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The report of the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY), recently transmitted by the Secretary-General to the Security Council, states that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia continues to fulfil its commitment to close its border with Bosnia and Herzegovina, that there have been no commercial transshipments across that border and that the Mission continues to enjoy full freedom of movement and good cooperation from the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. This constitutes the basis of the resolution just adopted. Though the report of the Co-Chairmen mentions some violations of the embargo, it also points out,

> "the qualities and characteristics of the problems are not significant". *(S/1995/510, para. 37)*

Given the very long border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has done its utmost.

Here I wish to emphasize that some delegations, including the Chinese delegation, have different opinions regarding the resolution just adopted. Certain delegations even have serious reservations. They made some very

useful and reasonable suggestions during the consultations. Regrettably, however, some sponsors were reluctant to have full coordination and incorporate them. This practice will undermine the democratization of the Council's work and will not help its work proceed smoothly in the future. However, considering that the main purpose of this resolution is to continue the partial suspension of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which is the first step towards the complete removal of sanctions, and will help create conditions for the peaceful settlement of the Bosnian question and encourage the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to make further efforts in that regard, the Chinese delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted.

The long absence of a solution to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia has not only brought tremendous sufferings to the people of the region, but has also posed a threat to peace and stability in Europe and the world as a whole. We are deeply concerned over the conflict in the former Yugoslavia and strongly urge the parties concerned to seek a solution acceptable to all through peaceful negotiations by taking into account the fundamental interests of the people there. At present, the priority should be to enter into a cease-fire.

We also maintain that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the independent States of the former Yugoslavia should be fully respected, their boundaries not be changed — especially not by force — and the countries in the region recognize each other and co-exist in amity and good-neighbourliness so as to bring an early end to the conflict and the war in the region. This will serve the long-term interests of the countries in the region and contribute to the maintenance of peace and stability in Europe and the world as a whole.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of China for the kind words he addressed to me.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Honduras.

My delegation was pleased to receive the conclusions of the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) and the Committee's certification of the closure of the borders between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of Bosnian Serb forces, as contained in the report submitted by the Secretary-General on the activities of the Mission of the Conference.

We are grateful for that report, which concludes by certifying that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia continues to fulfil its commitment to close the border with Bosnia and Herzegovina and that there have been no commercial transshipments across that border. My delegation also notes that the Mission of the Conference, some minor incidents notwithstanding, enjoys full freedom of movement in that country and enjoys the cooperation of the Yugoslav authorities, which are effectively implementing the legislation relating to the closure of the border.

We hope that the adoption of today's resolution, for which my delegation voted in favour, will serve to stimulate the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to step up their efforts to make the closure of the international border more effective.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.